



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

THE GERUNDIVE ONCE MORE: OSCAN *Anafriss*.

The phonetic objections to my gerundive theory (A. J. P. XV 217 sq.) which arise from Oscan-Umbrian I sought to explain away in vol. XVI, p. 1, but my explanations are rejected by Mr. Horton-Smith (ib., p. 222). My theory referred Sk. infinitives in *-a-dh(y)āi*, Greek infinitives in *-a(σ)-θαι*,¹ and Lat. gerundives in *-en-dae* (dat. sg. fem.) to an Aryan base *-m̐-dh(y)āi*. To this Aryan base there might be a by-form *-m̐-dyāi* (Noreen, *Urgerm.* Lautlehre, §51). Mr. Smith's answer to this is as follows: "Nor, I think, does his concluding observation, that 'there was an Aryan doublet to *ndh*, viz. *nd*, represented in Grk. *πυθμήν* || *πύνδαξ*,' give him much help; for it is thereby implied that the gerundive, which was purely an Italic development (v. A. J. P. XV 195), may have had two quite separate starting-points—one in Latin, the other in Umbr.-Osc." The phrase I have italicized in the citation begs the whole question. My argument is simply this: if the gerundive formation in Italic cannot come from **m̐-dhai*, then it can come from the Aryan by-form *°m̐-dai*, and I have all along claimed that the formation is Aryan (A. J. P. XV 217).

I repeat once more, however, that there is absolutely nothing to prove that Aryan *-mdh-* did not give Italic *-np-*, Osc.-Umbr. *nd > nn* || *n*. I believe now, as before, that the separative suffix *-de* of Lat. *inde* and *unde* is directly akin to the Greek *-θεν* of *ἔν-θεν* and *πό-θεν*, and not akin to the locative *-δε* of *ἐνθά-δε*. I do not believe the validity of the comparison of *in-de* with *ἔν-θεν*, and Sk. *adha* can be gainsaid, inasmuch as it is a comparison of finished words, not of suffixes taken here and there; all three forms mean 'thereupon,' the Latin and Greek 'thence,' and the Latin and Sanskrit 'then.' So far, however, from being dogmatic on this point, I think we shall have to recognize an Aryan doublet

¹ So, and not *-ε-<σ>θαι*, the latter being analogical *λύσασθαι* (aor.): *λύσεσθαι* (fut.): *λύεσθαι* (pres.) = 2d plur. *λύσασθε*: *λύσεσθε*: *λύεσθε*; on the origin of *σ* in *σθ* I refer to A. J. P. XVI 3. Note the so-called aor. *πρίασθαι*.

dha || *da*¹ behind all this variety (l. c., p. 2). I am perfectly willing to accept the verdict that my equation Aryan *ndh* > Osc.-Umbr. *nn* || *n* is 'unproven' (*sic*), but I wish also to make it clear that the equation *ndh* > *nf* is even less proved. In Umbrian the laws *mf* > *mb* and *nχ* > *ng* seem well established (v. Planta, Gramm., 465 sq.); there is plausibility even for *np* > *nd*, especially as we have the analogous changes just instanced. There can be little doubt that *°vendu* is akin to Germ. *wenden*, and represents Aryan **vendhetōd*, either through **vendetu* or **venptu* (according to v. Planta, l. c., 468), but just as plausibly through **venntu* with a previous stage **vend-tu*. It may well have been that *-ndh-* and *-nd-* fell together into *-nd-* before the change to *nn* was completed.

Now there is nothing, *absolutely nothing*, to prove that Aryan *ndh* became *-nf-* in Oscan or Umbrian. The only argument for such a change comes from *Anafriss*, which is explained by Bugge (K. Z. II 386) as 'Imbribus,' according to which we should expect **Emfriss* or **Enefriss* (v. Planta, 455); by Henzen (Ann. del Inst. 1848, 400) as *Inferis*, showing change of declension and bad vocalization; and referred by v. Planta (l. c., 456) to *√an* 'breathe,' <**an-dhr-* or **an-s-r-*, that is to say to no known word. Bücheler's claim (Rh. M. 37, 644) that no sufficient explanation of this word has yet been given seems to me to still hold good.

I venture, then, to propose a new one. *Anafriss* occurs in a Samnite inscription (Zvetaieff, Inscr. It. In. M. D., p. 32) among a group of deities to whom regular sacrifices shall be offered; just preceding it come *Diumpāis* 'nymphs' (?), *Liganakdikei Entraī*, which seems to mean Law-giver mid-<temple>-goddess' (Bücheler, Lex. Ital. XV b; Grassmann, K. Z. XVI 118); just following comes *Maatois* 'Matutis' (Grassmann), but 'Manibus' (Bücheler, ib. XVI b). In *Anafriss* I propose to see Grk. ἀμφορεύς 'jar, cinerary urn' (ω 74). Of its borrowing in Italic Lat. *amphora* gives testimony. The Romans used *amphorae* as coffins (Smith, Dict. Antiq., s. v.), and the similar *ollae* were in regular use as receptacles for the ashes of the dead (cf. also ω 74). The Arval brothers worshipped the *ollae* (cf. v. Henzen, Acta Fr. Arv. 30, Juv. VI 341, Prudent. Peristyl. II 277, there cited). These *ollae* may have been mere utensils in the sacrifice; thus in the present inscription *Patana* (= Lat. *patina* 'dish') is

¹ I have nowhere said, by the way, that the *-do* of *endo* || *indu* is for Aryan *-dho*, though my critic is excusable for so interpreting me.

worshipped, and the Romans worshipped *Patella* 'little dish,' both divinities being subsequently connected with *patere*, and explained by Arnobius as 'patefaciendis rebus praestituta' 'goddess of shooting grain.' In Plautus the *di patellarii* (Cist. 520) are understood (cf. Schol. to Persius, III 56) as being the Lares.

It may be noted further that in India, where the worship of ancestors was highly developed, the mortuary urns were sex-marked (cf. Āçvalāyana Gr̥h. Sū. IV 5. 2), showing thus an intermediate stage on the way to development of regular images. In the Umbrian cult also there was a large employment of jars, if not a direct worship of them. The goddess specially so worshipped is *Praestota Serfia*, who corresponds with *Perna Kerria* of our inscription, these goddesses having the same epithet (probably), and names of the same meaning 'she who stands before.' Note also in our inscription *Anterstata* 'she who stands in the middle.' We can hardly doubt that Grassmann is right in explaining these titles by the position of the statues (in temple or garden), or by the order in which they are worshipped. Now, in the Latin *Lares Praestites* we have an epithet like *Praestota*, *Perna*, and the Lares, as we have seen, were *Di Patellarii* 'gods of the jars.' Possibly *Praestota*, etc., were special groups of Manes (sometimes fem. in inscriptions). In any case, whether as simple jars or as images of the Manes, the Italic peoples worshipped *amphorae* (*ollae*).

I propose then to connect *Anafriss* with Grk. ἀμφορεύς. There is no reason why the Samnites should not have inflected ἀμφορεύς according to the 4th conjugation, into which it would most naturally fall. Thus *Anafriss* (with anaptyptic -a-, v. Planta, l. c., 268) would correspond to a Latin **amphoribus* sound for sound. There is some question, though, whether -mf- gave -nf- in Oscan, as it does in Latin (? *anfr-actus*) and Umbrian (*an-ferener*). The only word that suggests a different phonetic process is *amfr-et* 'ambiunt,' where *amfr-* is an extension of **amfi* by the compv. suffix -r, as in *inter*, *super*, *subter*, etc. It is a reasonable supposition, I believe, that phonetic change was retarded in its development in words newly coined by analogy, and this we might consider here. Further, Oscan has in *am-vianud*, *am-nod* (Corsen, K. Z. V 84) a form *am-* related to *ambi*. In *am-vianud* we have the result of primitive **amf-vianud*¹, shortened to *am-vianud*

¹ It may be well also to note (cf. Noreen, l. c.) that there was a chance for **ambh-* || *amb-* in the Aryan period.

before the change *mf* > *nf* set in; for *-mv-* I note Faliscan *com-vivium*. The form *am-* would also have naturally arisen in composition with initial *p, b, m*. Now a form *amfr-* would not part company with *am-*. Entirely different would be the treatment of *am-fr-* in loan-words like ἀμφορεύς, where no semasiotic notion was to be preserved. Here, as the Italic *f* was a labiodental, and not a pure labial, we can understand why *μφ* gave *nf*.

Here arises the difficulty of the phonetic character of *φ* and the other Greek aspirates. I believe, with Miss Dawes (Pronunc. of Grk. Asp., p. 102), that the internal evidence of Greek favors, on the whole, a spirantic pronunciation. Her illustrations (p. 47 sq.) are convincing that Latin loan-words with *p, t, c* for *φ, θ, χ* do not prove that the latter were aspirates. The question may have been a dialectic one with the Greeks, and the Italians had more than one dialect to borrow from. For the Oscans, however, it is certain that they represented their *f* by *φ* in Φαλισκοί, and in the coin-legend 'ΦΙΣΤΕΛΙΑ' (*Fistluis*) (Zvet., l. c., p. 78). Further, Bücheler reads *Falε[φ]* (= *valens*) in an Oscan inscription (Zvet., l. c., 74). It is not assuming very much to suppose that they also represented *φ* by their *f*, and so it is fair to suppose that Greek ἀμφορεύς may have become in Oscan **amfrus* > **anafrus*. On this point I can do no better than to cite from W. Schulze (KZ. 32, 389): "Ganz anders liegen die dinge bei *ph* [for Greek *φ*], das seine eigene, von den schicksalen des *p* durchweg getrennte geschichte gehabt hat. Schon frühzeitig ist es—wenigstens local und in den ungebildeten volksschichten—mit *f* zusammengefallen. Bereits die pompejanischen pinsel- und griffelinschriften bieten *Dafne Fileto Fyllis Trofime*."

But whether *Anafriss* is a borrowed word or not (= ἀμφορεύς), there is more against its comparison with *Inferis* than with any other of its possible congeners. Now, this comparison is the only basis for claiming that the *-nn-* of Osc.-Umbr. gerundives cannot come from Aryan *m-dh-*.

My theory explains the entire syntax of the gerundive, with its attraction for its object (A. J. P. XV 220). This is a consideration that should outweigh a trifling phonetic irregularity, though I have shown that there is none. In conclusion I would sound a warning against dogmatism about the inviolability of phonetics, especially as to this group *nd*. Thus we have in Latin *tennitur* beside *tenditur*—"folk-dialect"! We also have *bos* for normal **vos*—"loan-word from some dialect or other"! Such are the

defences of the sacrosanct phoneticians, and by freely using them both no one can fail to make good the *a-priori* claim of Inviolable Phonetic Law. I have shown in another place¹ that this is a dangerous working principle, particularly for dialects of fragmentary vocabulary.

EDWIN W. FAY.

TWO NOTES ON LATIN NEGATIVES.

The I.E. *ne* (Skr. *na*, Goth. *nī*, Lith. *nė*, O.B. *ne*, Osc.-Umbr. *ne*) is represented in certain Latin compounds, among which are several negative indefinite adverbs and the negative indefinite adjective pronoun *nūllus*. The list of common forms is *neutiquam*, *neutique* (late), *neuter*, *nunquam*, *nusquam*, *nullus*.

Brugmann (Grd. I 604, Anm. 2) left unexplained the relation of *-eu-* in *neuter* to *-u-* in *nūllus*, etc., until an explanation of the initial sound of *uter*, etc., should be given. J. Schmidt (K. Z. 32, 394 ff.) has established the fact that these indefinites are from a pronominal stem *qu*, the *q* before *u* being dropped in Latin when initial, but retained when medial, as in the compounds *alicubi* and *nēcubi*.

We have then to explain the absence of *-c-* in all these compounds and also the *-eu-* beside *u*. *Neuter* and *neutiquam* may be either transformates of older forms with *-c-* under the influence of the simplices or may have been formed after *qu-* became *u-*. For *neuter*, at least, the first explanation probably applies. We have a few cases of *necuter* retained, e. g. Lucret. 4, 1217 (where *neque* should be emended to *nec*) and 5, 839; Mart. 5, 20, 11; and C. I. L. VI 1527. Probably, too, *necuter* has sometimes been changed by copyists to *neuter*. These words have nothing to do with *nec* = 'non,' as the editors have supposed, but their *-c-* is the same as that of *nēcubi*, *alicubi*, etc.²

But the collocation of negative and indefinite is common, and composition, therefore, was easy at any period when *ne* existed

¹ Proceedings Am. Phil. Assoc. for 1895.

² In Trin. 282 *neque* of the Ambrosian should be kept. We have here verb, adverbial phrase, and object, each with a special negative, and *neque ullum* is used in place of *nullum* on account of the preceding *neque*'s. The passage is

Nolo ego cum improbis te viris, grate mi,
Neque in via neque in foro neque ullum sermonem exsequi.

In regard to a possible *ne-cunquem* see Schmidt as above, p. 403.